

**REMARKS**

By this response, Applicants have amended claim 98 to correct its dependency. Support can be found in the specification, for example, page 27, line 19 to page 28, line 16. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

In the Response to the Restriction Requirement dated August 20, 2008, Applicants elected acrylic acid/isobutyl acrylate/isobornyl acrylate copolymer as the copolymer, and acrylic acid as the additional monomer for prosecution on the merits, and submitted that claims 80-95, 97-112, and 114-161 read on the elected species. However, in the office communication dated October 24, 2008, the Examiner stated that “[t]he reply filed on August 20, 2008 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because . . . the claims specified by applicant in the reply to the restriction requirement do not appear to be the correct set of claims readable on the elected species.” *Id.* at page 2. Specifically, the Examiner noted that “claim 98 depends from claim 96, and claim 98 is stated to read on the elected species, claim 96 also necessarily reads on the elected species. Thus, the claim set upon which examination should properly proceed was unclear.” *Id.*

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out this discrepancy and submit that such confusion occurred because claim 98 had been inadvertently recited as dependent on claim 96 rather than claim 97. Applicants hereby correct the dependency of claim 98 and again submit that claims 80-95, 97-112, and 114-161 read on the elected species.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge  
the fee to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 22, 2008

By: /Mark D. Sweet/  
Mark D. Sweet  
Reg. No. 41,469